



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

The *Eighth Book of Thukydides*, hitherto the least favored of the family, seems to be destined to more abundant honor. Scarcely has one welcomed Mr. Tucker's edition when Mr. GOODHART's comes to the front and challenges attention (Macmillan & Co.). One is glad to see that Mr. Goodhart has taken his courage in both hands and, like Mr. Tucker, ventures to oppose the redoubtable Dr. Rutherford in his onslaught on the text of Thukydides. Continental critics and, one may add, American critics have never stood much in awe of Dr. Rutherford, but his swashbuckler ways at one time frightened some of the younger generation of English scholars out of their propriety, although it is tolerably evident now that Dr. Rutherford's brilliancy and dash are out of all proportion to his judgment. But while Mr. Goodhart is to be congratulated on his independence and his resolution, his work does not commend itself irresistibly. In his criticism there is a good deal of the *nodum in scirpo quaerere*, which so many people mistake for a short cut to a reputation for acuteness, and from his discussion of the 'verbal points' in Thukydides, for which he half-way apologizes in the Preface, there is very little to gain. The inductions made from von Essen's Index need illumination from a wider knowledge of the language, and some of the grammatical notes are trivial and for the advanced student, who alone is likely to meddle with the eighth book of Thukydides, utterly unnecessary. On Chapter IV, however, there is one long note that is welcome, but welcome only because it serves to point a moral. If a Greek sentence gives up its sense readily when read aloud, there is no need of a long discourse about its articulation, and so here a simple reading aloud of Chapter IV, with the right inflexion of the voice, makes the whole sentence—there is but one—perfectly transparent. It is a problem of parenthesis such as a student of Browning would make very light of.

παρεσκευάζοντο δὲ καὶ

Ἀθηναῖοι,

τὴν τε ναπηγίαν

καὶ Σούνιον

καὶ τό τε ἐν τῇ Λακωνικῇ

τειχισμα

καὶ τᾶλλα

μάλιστα δὲ τὰ τῶν ξυμμάχων

ὥσπερ διενόηθσαν ἐν τῷ

αὐτῷ χειμῶνι τούτῳ,

ξύλα ξυμπορισάμενοι

τειχίσαντες, ὅπως αὐτοῖς

ἀσφάλεια ταῖς σιταγωγαῖς ναυσὶν

εἴη τοῦ περίπλου,

ἐκλιπόντες δ' ἐνφοδόμησαν

παραπλέοντες ἐς Σικελίαν,

εἰ πού τι ἐδόκει ἀχρεῖον

ἀναλίσκεσθαι, ξυστελλόμενοι

ἐς εὐτέλειαν,

διασκοποῦντες ὅπως

μὴ σφῶν ἀποστήσονται.

But as I write, the *Γοργείη κεφαλὴ* of Dr. Rutherford's Fourth Book rises before me, the whole of the second column vanishes into the margin, and nothing is left but the petrified backbone of the sentence.

Perhaps I may be allowed to illustrate by a single specimen what is to me the irritating element in Mr. Goodhart's grammatical observations. On *τὰ περὶ τῆς πολιορκίας* (c. 14, 2) he remarks: 'In such phrases Thuc. appears to use gen. and acc. indifferently. For the gen. cf. VI 32, 3; VIII 26, 2. For the acc. I 13, 2; VIII 11, 3.' Now, the regular periphrasis is *τὰ περὶ* c. acc., according to the rule after verbs of happening. And the rare change to *τὰ περὶ* c. gen. is due almost invariably in classical times to the influence of some verb of saying or thinking in the neighborhood. To be sure, this is an old story, going back at least as far as Heindorf on Plato, *Phaedo* 57 B, but as some unwary novice may think that Mr. Goodhart has brushed away Heindorf, Krüger, Kühner, Breitenbach and the rest, it may be worth while to look into the examples adduced. VI 32, 3 *τὰ περὶ* is preceded by *ἡγγέλλετο*; VIII 26, 2 by *εἰδέναι* and the gen. is not surprising. In I 13, 2 *μεταχειρίσαι* naturally takes *περὶ* c. acc., and in VIII 11, 3 *ἡγγέλλθη* follows, and is not thought of until too late. In the passage under immediate consideration, VIII 14, 2, *γενομένων λόγων* precedes and *οὐ δηλώσαντων* follows, thus creating a complete atmosphere of *περὶ* c. gen. The Thukydidic examples of *τὰ περὶ* c. gen. have been collected by Debbert in his dissertation '*de praepositionum περὶ et ἀμφὶ usu Thucydideo*', pp. 11, 12, and they are all to be explained in the same way—that is, by the neighborhood of a verb that regularly takes *περὶ* c. gen. So, in addition to the passages given above, II 42, 1: *ἐμήκνυα*; VII 75, 4: *δεδιότας*; and in the book of Mr. Goodhart's predilection, 26, 3: *πυνθάνονται*; 33, 4: *ἀναζητήσαντες*; 54, 1: *ἀκούων χαλεπῶς ἔφερε*; 63, 1: *πυθόμενος*. Turning to another sphere we find the same principle true in the orators, who very seldom use *τὰ περὶ* c. gen., but when they do, yield only to the temptation of a verb or other word that takes *περὶ* c. gen. Lutz (*Die Praepositionen bei den attischen Rednern*, p. 133) cites Lys. 4, 1 (*ἀρνεῖσθαι*); Isokr. 12, 232 (*ἐλνπῆθην καὶ βαρέως ἔφερον*) (cf. §§131, 132: *δυσχεραίνειν περὶ* c. gen.); Dem. 57, 67 (*πῶς ἂν ἐπιδείξαιμι*); 68 (*ἀκούσατε*); Isok. 15, 59 (*ἀνὰγνωθι*); Ep. II 14 (*παραλείπτειν*); Dem. 4, 36 (*ἀόριστα*). Most interesting of all is Dem. 27, 30, because it seems to violate the rule, and for that reason I give it in full: *καὶ μὲν, ὧ ἄνδρες δικασταί, καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ ἐλέφαντος καὶ σιδήμον τοῦ καταλειθθέντος παραπλήσιά πως πεποιήκασιν*. But *πεποιήκασιν* here carries with it the notion of a *περὶ* c. gen. verb, as is shown by the next sentence: *οὐδὲ γὰρ ταῦτ' ἀποφαίνουσιν*. Herodotos, Xenophon and Plato seem to be fairly steady, though Lina in his dissertation '*de praepositionum usu Platonico*' tries to show for Plato that in the later dialogues his usage approaches that of Polybios. But a mere counting of *περὶ* c. acc. and *περὶ* c. gen. will not suffice. That Polybios is not clear in his mind need not surprise us. See the examples in Krebs, *Die Praepositionen bei Polybios*, S. 105. Krebs (S. 99) saves some of the examples on the principle already given, but the consciousness has evidently broken down wholly, as it had broken down here and there in the best times. But for Thukydidic Goodhart's examples prove nothing whatever.

Professor BURTON's book on the *Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* (Chicago, University Press of Chicago) withdraws itself from the serious consideration of syntacticians both by its plan and by its execution. It has to do professedly with exegetical and not with historical syntax, as if exegetical syntax did not demand historical syntax, not only incidentally but fundamentally. In fact, one great trouble about N. T. syntax has been the failure to appreciate the historical relations of N. T. Greek. In any other sphere such a hotchpotch as Winer's Grammar would have been a stale anachronism years ago, and perhaps even 'telic' and 'ecbatic' would have ceased from troubling. True, by keeping close under cover of the authorities on classical Greek syntax, Professor Burton has to a certain extent evaded responsibility, though he cannot be congratulated everywhere on his choice of a leader. So, for instance, his departure from the ordinary treatment of the participle is hardly to be considered an improvement. And yet, despite his care to shelter himself behind the shield of this syntactical Ajax and that, he has exposed himself at a number of points, and such blunders as *ὅς λάβῃ ἂν*, *ὅς διόσῃ ἂν* (§150) and *συμφέρει οὐ γαμῆσαι* (§264) are without defence. It is bad method to make the chief example for the gnomic aorist (§43) (1 Pet. 1, 24) a quotation from the Septuagint; it is contrary to the author's own principles given forth in the preface to bring into bold relief the unreal relative (§302), a construction that is very rare in standard Greek and, according to Professor Burton himself, non-existent in the N. T. After all that has been written about *ὥστε*, it seems strange to have *ὥστε* with inf. considered as an intrusion on the sphere of *ὥστε* with ind. (§235) (cf. A. J. P. VII 171, XIV 241); nor is it much less strange to find an article which was written to show that *ὅπως* with subj. and *ὅπως ἂν* with subj. are not equivalent, cited to prove their indifference (§195). Under the aor. part. of subsequent action (§142) there are two examples—one an articular participle, which does not count, as it is a mere parenthetical identification, and the other is Acts 25, 13, where it is a superstition to retain *ἀσπασάμενοι*. 'Some primitive error,' say Westcott and Hort, 'is not impossible.' The long note (§343) to justify the 'supposition' that interrogative opt. with *ἂν* in dependent discourse is an original opt. with *ἂν* is a waste of printer's ink on an elementary matter. These are a few of the points that a cursory examination reveals, enough perhaps to show that Greek of every sphere must be studied in the light of the history of the language from the beginning.

But these jottings on Professor Burton's book would have been pigeonholed with a host of other annotations on current manuals, if his remarks on the imperative future had not reminded me of a little article which I had written some time ago *à propos* of Rosenberg's new edition of Westermann's *Demosthenes* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1890). It is too long for *Brief Mention*, it is too short for a separate article, it is too late for a review. But the subject it may be worth while to give, as it deals with an inveterate superstition. In §67 R. we are told by Professor Burton that the negative of the prohibitory future in the N. T. is not *μή*, 'as commonly in classical Greek, but *οὐ*.' Then follow the authorities. Now, when one reflects that this precious rule about *μή* with fut. ind. as an imperative rests on just two passages of Attic prose—Lys. XXIX 13 and Dem. XXIII 117—both open to suspicion, both suggestive of

emendation, one cannot suppress one's astonishment at such an aberration as Aken's 'häufig auch μή' (Tempus u. Modus, §44), and at such an expenditure of metaphysics as Rosenberg has thought fit (l. c.) to cite from the Classical Review (II, p. 323). But though I have almost taken a vow to be silent on the subject of the Greek negative, I may be forced to return to the pestilent theme before long.

All that Professor JEBB had to fear in undertaking the course of lectures which he delivered in the spring of 1892 on the Percy Turnbull Memorial Foundation was the unavoidable comparison with himself. But from that comparison with himself he has come forth with his wonted triumphant adequacy, and his lectures on the *Growth and Influence of Classical Greek Poetry* (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co.) exemplify all that he has to say about 'Hellenic clearness of outline,' 'Hellenic obedience to the sense of measure and harmony.' He has said the best things in the best way; and while the best things are inevitable and must be said over again, unless one is content to fall into mere paradox, still those who know the ground traversed by Professor Jebb will welcome new angles of vision and new touches of color which are gained by his guidance. His style is limpid, but does not lack strength. His rare figures illuminate his theme and do not interpose a screen of impertinent imagery between the student and the study. Especially admirable is the way in which he has solved the difficult problem of such a poet as Pindar. Instead of rising to Pindaric or pseudo-Pindaric heights in the characteristic of the Songs of Victory, he leads the reader up to the point at which he can enjoy the poet himself, and then makes way for a felicitous rendering of Pindar's splendid diction, and Pindar is made responsible for his own intoxication. As is well known, not only is Professor Jebb a close student of Pindar, but he has himself handled Pindaric forms with unequalled mastery; and yet he is no stranger to the charm of Simonidean simplicity—and an epigram which breathes Simonidean simplicity¹ opens the volume. Still,

¹ In Memoriam.

PERCY GRAEME TURNBULL,

NATUS EST MAII DIE VICESIMO OCTAVO A. D. MDCCCLXXXVIII,
OBIIIT FEBRUARII DUODEVICESIMO A. D. MDCCCLXXXVII.

οἷα πρὶν ἀνθῆσαι ῥόδον ὄλλυται, ἐξεμαράνθης,
εἶαρος οὐδ' ἐνάτου βῆλ' ἄμειψάμενος·
σοῦ δὲ χάριν Μούσαις, ὅσας κ' εὖ φάος ἔρχεται ἦρος
δῶρα παρ' εὐσεβέων προσφέρεται γονέων.

The following translation has been sent to *Brief Mention* :

Like as a rose that ere it flow'r is lost
So didst thou fade away,
The threshold of thy ninth spring not yet crossed;
But for thy sake do they,
Thy loving parents, to the Muses bring,
As often as returns the light of spring,
A pious offering.

Simonides himself is not so near his heart as is Pindar, and one feels a slight jar when Simonides is called 'a clever and versatile man of the world, with all the subtle and graceful Ionic gifts, but without much depth of conviction and feeling.' To those who do not know poets in the flesh it is hardly conceivable that such a person should have been a master of pathos, but Professor Jebb's wide experience of literary life has doubtless taught him thus to distinguish between the poet and the man. If, according to Sainte-Beuve's famous sentence, the man survives the poet in three-fourths of us, the poet assuredly survives the man in many of the elect. At all events, the scholar does.

By the publication of his *Monumenta Linguae Ibericae* (Berlin, Georg Reimer, 1893) the eminent epigraphist, Professor HÜBNER, has completed his great work on Spanish Inscriptions. The first half of the book contains the *Prolegomena*, the second the coins and inscriptions. In the first two chapters of the *Prolegomena* a full and interesting account is given of the labors of numismatists and epigraphists in this tangled field of research. The third is devoted to the discussion of the alphabet, which is derived not from the Greek, but from the Phoenician; the fourth to the language, which is shown to have prevailed over the whole peninsula and the adjacent parts of Gaul, inhabited by an Iberian population. This Iberian language continued unmixed with the language of the Kelts, with which it has no affinity either in formation or inflexion. It is, in fact, the lonely parent of the lonely Basque of to-day, and Professor Hübner closes his introduction by commending the further investigation of the problem in these words: *Umbræ, quam depinximus, vitam fortasse inspirabunt qui Humboldtio duce linguae Vasconum hodiernæ formam, quatenus recuperari potest, vetustissimam comparare suscipient cum reliquiis a nobis collectis lectis explicatis.*